



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/637,512	08/11/2000	Stanley M. Goldin	42,982 C3-CPA-C	1159

7590

03/27/2002

David G Conlin
Dike Bronstein Roberts & Cushman
130 Water Street
Boston, MA 02109

EXAMINER

O SULLIVAN, PETER G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1621

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/637,512

Applicant(s)
Goldin et al.

Examiner
Peter O'Sullivan

Art Unit
1621



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 5-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1621

1. Claims 1-24 are pending in this application which should be reviewed for errors. In response to the restriction requirement, applicants elected group I, claims 1-15 and 24 with traverse. Upon the further requirement for the election of a single disclosed species, applicants' elected the species of N-(4-sec-butylphenyl)-N-(4-tertbutylbenzyl)guanidine. Applicants' guanidines which are N-benzyl, N-phenyl substituted are examined therewith with all other compounds and claims 5-~~15~~²⁷ held withdrawn.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-4 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douglas et al. '077 who disclose compounds given by the formula at the bottom of column 1 to be ganglionic blocking agents. X1 and X2 may be substituents overlapping applicants' and R may


Art Unit: 1621

be aryl. R1-R3 may be hydrogen. Douglas et al. disclose N,N-disubstituted guanidines in the examples. The instant invention differs from the teaching of Douglas in that Douglas makes close, but not overlapping compounds. It would have been prima facie obvious at the time the invention was made to start with the teaching of Douglas et al., to make generically disclosed compounds in view of close N,N-disubstituted guanidines actually made and to expect them to be useful as ganglionic blocking agents.

4. Claims 1-4 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. Weber et al. disclose N,N' disubstituted guanidines wherein the substituents may be aryl or aralkyl optionally substituted by applicants' substituents. The compounds of Weber et al. have utility in the treatment of stroke, neurodegenerative diseases, etc., but differ from applicants' compounds as position isomers. It would have been prima facie obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to start with the teaching of Weber, but to make N,N-disubstituted compounds and to expect them to be useful in the treatment of stroke, neurodegenerative diseases, etc. Position isomers are held to be obvious. In re Mills, 126 U.S.P.Q. 513.

5. No claim is allowed.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Peter O'Sullivan at telephone number (703) 308-4526.


PETER O'SULLIVAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200